

REMARKS

Claims 6-10 and 12-13 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-10 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ferry et al.* (US 6,150,798) in view of *Schaffer* (US 5,498,984). Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection.

Claim 6 recites "a detecting circuit for activating either said first power supply circuit or said second power supply circuit to convert said input voltage to said output voltage based on an amount of current supplied to said first and second power supply circuits."

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed detecting circuit is disclosed by *Ferry* in col. 6, lines 44-51. In col. 6, lines 31-32 of *Ferry*, *Ferry* teaches that it is preferable to "use signals available within the load to control the regulator." Thus, *Ferry* teaches the usage of signals at the load to control the regulator. In contrast, the claimed detecting circuit makes its selection based on the amount of current supplied to a first power supply circuit and a second power supply circuit, and not based on signals at the load, as disclosed by *Ferry*.

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the cited references teach the detection based on current by way of *Ferry*'s TU signal indicative of the charges of a battery with respect to a threshold value (col. 6, lines 44-46) modified by the teachings of *Schaffer*. *Ferry*'s voltage regulator has three possible operating modes other than the switched-mode power supply operation (col. 6, lines 36-38), and the THRU mode as described in col. 6, lines 44-51 (which includes the above-cited passage) is one of the three possible operating modes. The THRU mode can be used if an output terminal S is only connected to an input of a step-down post-regulator of voltage Vout or to inputs of post-regulators of such type (col. 6, lines 39-42). Since the output of the claimed voltage converter is not connected to "an input of a step-down post-regulator of voltage Vout or to inputs of post-regulators of such type," as stated by *Ferry*, it is clear that the TU signal is not applicable to the claimed detecting circuit.

Besides, the TU signal indicative of the charge state of the battery (*i.e.*, recharagable battery 2 in Figure 3) is still not the same as "an amount of current supplied to said first and second power supply circuits," as claimed. This can be shown by the example used by *Ferry*. In col. 6, lines 48-50, *Ferry* states that "for an output voltage Vout of 2.7 volts, signal TU is in the low state when the voltage across the battery is lower than 3 volts." Thus, it is clear signal TU is not the same as "an amount of current supplied to said first and second power supply circuits," regardless of whether the output voltage can be converted to current in view of *Schaffer*, as suggested by the Examiner. Also, the TU signal is taken at the output (or battery) and not "supplied to said first and second power supply circuits," as claimed

Because the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 6-10 and 12-13 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicant believes that independent Claim 6 along with its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Lenovo Deposit Account No. 50-3533.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT